

Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan Preferred Alternative Subcommittee Meeting

April 14, 2004

9:00 – 3:00

Ochoco Large Conference Room

Present:

Terry Morton, Facilitator

Mimi Graves

Jerry Cordova

Ed Faulkner

Sarah Thomas

Anne Holmquist

Jamie Hildebrandt

Joani Dufourd

Katy Yoder

Nancy Gilbert

Glen Ardt

Kent Gill

Bill Fockler

BLM: Lisa Clark, Bill Dean, Mollie Chaudet, Robert Towne, Greg Currie.

Terry: Introduction and Ground Rules

See handouts:

1. Agenda
2. Ground Rules
3. Issue Team Meeting Schedule
4. Newsletter
5. News release dates
6. Press release
7. PA Subcommittee Representatives

We're looking to providing an open, manageable, process that maintains the continuity that we've had so far. We'd like one representative member at the table, but alternates may be present – they won't sit at the table, but they'll be consulted frequently during breaks. You may request a break if you want to consult.

Public Input: last ½ hour – 5 min ea unless more agreed to by group

Question: Has public been notified? *Notices mailed out to mailing list re mtg schedule, website, and news release with PAO folks. Not seen in the Nugget, but probably went into the Bulletin last week. Verified – yes, 40 newspapers received a news release, notified people on the mailing list (2000), and included notice on website. See Handout #6*

Mar 16 meeting had a list to identify representatives? Can we get a list of people actually selected to represent the various interest areas? Should have been in the meeting minutes for 3/16, but we can get it out again (Handout #7: *Provided at break*).

Consensus & this Consensus Process

What does this mean? Doesn't mean talk until you all agree...we want a collaborative feel that is all inclusive. Consensus process – this means that we work toward group agreements that everyone can live with (not first choice maybe, but best interest of the community). We're looking for a balance here. See the five finger chart for "test" of how close together we are. This will provide everyone an opportunity to quickly show how close we are to group consensus.

If we don't get there...we won't keep talking forever. We'll try and be creative, but if we can't get "2" or better, then we'll give BLM a list of interests met, and interests not reconciled...BLM will take recommendations and make a final decision.

Think of the process as a funnel – we started big and we've narrowed it down to 7 Alts. Narrowed more, and now we're down toward the bottom of the funnel. We're not here to go back to the top, but we will resolve final sticking points. Let's work within this range, to get it to the larger group in May.

Question: What is the weight of public comment in this process? This will be a somewhat subjective judgment, but recognize that consensus will be arrived at by the sub-committee members – you will have to weigh their input.

Question: What about additional letters? We'll read them of course, but they won't be included in the final report of the public comments. We'll take and evaluate that input here, but they need to be on topic. The group here can take the comments made in this meeting and use or not use them to arrive at consensus.

At this point, the most effective input for general public: come here and talk

Clarification: re: questionable form letters – only one thrown out, no others verified.

Constructive Communication Rules

See handout.

Robert: Setting the Stage

Marathon analogy – this effort is also an endurance event.

We're part of a unique process here – we're breaking the mold by doing a collaborative effort – recognized by State Office and the Washington Office. We've done a great job getting to a balance, and that was recognized in the comments. It's not perfect, and we still have to reach consensus on some other areas, but overall it's been an impressive effort.

Mollie: Outlining the Process

BLM Criteria for Consideration of Changes

We've gone through the comments – there will be a fair number that we won't deal with here. We'll really only look at what will modify the Preferred Alternative (PA). Then,

we'll be looking at those we think that will meet more/better interests by modifying PA. Need to meet our needs – which becomes the best balance of most needs.

We've also narrowed it down to things that we have a hope of reaching consensus. We can tell by the comments that this may not be a reasonable item to discuss, and the decisions will be made by the line officer.

SO, well be looking at things we can live w/, meet Purpose and Need, that will improve how we meet more interests or provide a better balance, is within the scope of decisions, and that we can hopefully reach consensus.

IDT Member's Presentations

Specialists will discuss range of comments, and then talk about options for modifying the PA. That's what we'll be working on.

We've made some changes based on internal review; tech edits, map edits, etc. or some changes we felt were needed that may not be brought forward for consensus, but we'll inform you about those so you are aware of any changes that may influence consensus on items that are brought forward to the committee.

Then we'll look at options developed by IDT to respond to public comments, or, in some cases, internal agency comment or direction.

Question: As each person gets up – they'll share any changes? *Yes. We'll tell you what we've worked on and if any decisions have been made.*

Start with 600 pound gorilla - Recreation/wildlife and Recreation Trail Uses, most likely first 5 meetings, then we'll get to the other topics.

Motorized (Open, limited, closed) Recreation Greg Currie

Plan direction for travel mgmt. We're zoning all the land Open, Limited, Closed for motorized travel.

- Direction is both map allocation (color)
- Direction is text/wording (objectives & guidelines)
- Both have been adjusted as part of the proposals brought to you

Summarize public comments:

- Range across spectrum from “big fence” to “all concrete.”
- Not enough motorized trails opportunities, to more shared use, to no shared use;
- Not enough/too many seasonal closures,
- Comments of spec places (canyons, etc.);
- General range on lack of motorized recreation opportunities in La Pine and Prineville Reservoir
- Need for more controls, seasonal restrictions for wildlife.
- A lot of one side or the other (Badlands, next to my backyard, etc.).
- Implementation (How are you going to? Here's how you should)

There were also internal comments on inconsistencies, etc. small changes/tweaks.

Tried to develop options where consensus was possible. We also recognize areas where no consensus would ever be reached. We found no opportunities for greater consensus on some issues in the Badlands, Northwest – we couldn't improve the balance of uses by changing these.

Generally, we've looked at (*note that items with an * were items that were not brought forward to subcommittee for consensus, but were BLM changes being made*):

- Dropping the seasonal closure on the block in Juniper canyon – we'll apply a year- round closure to deal with mudbogging and dumping.*
- Extend closure on North Unit Irrigation canal that runs west to Redmond, to the south side of Highway 126– this was based on law enforcement input.*
- Inconsistencies on map at Eagle rock at Prineville Reservoir on north side – we'd apply a seasonal closure Dec – Apr to be consistent w/ text.*
- Change straight line allocations (boundaries between recreation emphasis areas) to make them match on-the-ground features. Power lines, road, etc. to tie boundaries to features so folks can see it.*
- Provide flexibility to do above in other areas.*
- La Pine center section identified as Motorized trails – doesn't provide enough – community needs more. Remove seasonal closure for south 1/3 of La Pine for more motorized use. Offers more flexibility in areas designated at roads only or non-motorized area.
- Also looking at provide links to get to areas outside the closed areas, also add flexibility to develop play areas (e.g. La Pine, Prineville Reservoir – north). Often not specifically mapped, just flexible for an area. Do this instead of doing little choppy changes or changing the whole color to meet a small need in an area. Some direction will be provided for offering smaller scale OHV uses to meet community needs, while keeping it away from upper portion of the reservoir near wildlife concern areas. Similar in La Pine with trail linkage issue. Allow ltd development in areas identified as limited to roads, or non-motorized – flexible in the kinds of roads areas.

Question: What was the original reason for seasonal closure? Elk Winter Range – it will remain Primary Wildlife emphasis with patch size guidelines, so roads will go around large, unfragmented blocks. We'll still keep a 70% HE. This idea was developed in response to concurrence with ODFW and numerous other comments.

- Tweak closure along Crooked River rim (south end) slightly.*
- Looked at Cline Buttes (for more motorized use opportunities) – comments ranges all shared, all closed, to a mix. Balance of use still an issue, so we're still looking at shared or motorized trail use. Preferred Alternative closed east side because it was too small and bounded, so it wasn't suitable for motorized recreation. The amount of private land, the buttes, management opportunities and existing condition (steep slopes) make it presently not maintainable or manageable. Overall, it didn't seem like a good spot for shared use. Hard part is to

have enough space for trails with areas to avoid, etc. e.g. Tumalo Canals ACEC, - we'll work with trail/road designations – limited to shared/separate, etc.*

- Cline Buttes - Want flex to place motorized trails in association with canals but outside canyons, etc.

(**Note:** This RMP won't get to a level of specificity that everyone needs – we're offering plan direction for areas – not “this will happen exactly like this” stuff. The levels of decisions are regarding the *conditions* under which uses will be allowed and specific details will be identified in the interim system).

Question: Once the plan is signed: how will folks know where to go? *Maps published, signs, interim system map, press releases, etc. We'll also move to Area management plans that will have the final road and trail system.* Need to recognize that this group would like to participate in the implementation/enforcement discussion – so that this document doesn't just become another pile of paper.

Recap: The proposed changes are to provide flexibility for a variety of uses; w/o making huge travel management changes that would affect the overall balance. This is ½ the picture, because we're also looking at meeting wildlife objectives while still providing some year-round use in some areas.

Bill Dean – Wildlife

Comment review:

- whole spectrum again,
- Too much consideration for wildlife all the way to way too little consideration.
- There were a core group of comments that said the preferred alternative provided a good mix of uses and protections.
- Also a fair number that there wasn't enough effects analysis for wildlife.
- In La Pine - will be adding analysis to LP, and improving analysis in the whole planning area in general.

Main focus has been around: Habitat Effectiveness (HE), Motorized Recreation/Motorized Travel, Open/Limited/Closed, trail densities, and seasons of use.

We've looked at:

- Expanding seasonal closure down in South Millican (no change made after ID Team discussion)
- Mayfield block – recommendation to change secondary to primary wildlife emphasis (recognize that wildlife is secondary but the objectives and guidelines still provide for use and maintenance of wildlife in that area).
- Area wide – pronghorn: not enough done, and they have a low percent of their habitat managed as primary. BLM recognizes this, and in Alternative 7 it states BLM will develop a conservation strategy to manage for pronghorn with Oregon Military Department and Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife – and we'll actually do a multi-species habitat conservation strategy and apply it to Bend/Redmond,

Mayfield, Badlands, Millican Plateau, North and South Millican and Horse Ridge in the planning area – sage grouse, elk, and deer - and go interagency with this as well.

- Recognize that we have guidelines for primary wildlife emphasis (HE, trail/road densities, patch sizes). Some interest that one of those – HE – become a standard (objective) instead of a guideline. That consideration hasn't been brought forward, and will remain a guide. HE is a good measure for large blocks of land, but a number of our blocks are highly fragmented to begin with, with regards to land ownership – so we have other guidelines to use in patchier places like Northwest.

Note on Wildlife Emphasis & HE: Three objectives for management of wildlife are: Primary – retain high use by wildlife, Secondary – maintain a moderate amount of use, Minor – still have to consider wildlife, and maintain distribution and persistence, but not focus of our efforts. Habitat effectiveness is a model created for elk in the Blue Mtns. It has several components: disturbance – mainly by open motorized travel routes, and habitat factors such as arrangement and distribution of cover and forage. There is no comparable model for sage grouse. Our HE model has been modified to capture open motorized route influence, and provides a guideline for sizes of unfragmented patches. This hybrid of components is intended to be able to provide for a variety of species including deer, elk, pronghorn, and sage grouse. Also noted that, because of the generally fragmented nature of the BLM lands in the planning area, there are lots of areas where BLM does not have jurisdiction over the roads (e.g. county roads and state highways), and therefore, the ability to modify road influence factors may be very limited. That can make the HE index guideline, based on road influence, unattainable in some areas. That does not change our emphasis to manage for primary or secondary emphasis for those uses where we have some jurisdiction, but it may mean that the HE or road density guideline may not be met in all areas.

- The comment was made that while Alt 7 provided for 100% of sage grouse habitat as primary, BLM still allowed most sage grouse habitat to be open year-round. Yes, 51% of sage grouse habitat would allow motorized travel to occur year-round (on designated routes), but 49% of roads were still open, but rest was closed, limited or closed seasonally. We need to recognize that some open areas still have limitations on motorized travel (i.e. managing for 70% HE provides large, unfragmented patches that are essentially “closed” areas, without roads or motorized trails).
- We initially focused on the analysis of arterials and collectors since that was what we were making decisions on potentially changing in this plan – but we received comments that we needed to display the effects of local roads. While we did analyze effects on general source habitats, we didn't for specific species such as sage grouse, pronghorn, etc. and we'll add the effects of local roads into the Final, which should be displayed in Alternative 1 or the affected environment. But you won't see an analysis of local roads by each alternative because we are not selecting the specific local roads to be open or closed. Future site-specific management will dictate what will happen to the local roads – so the RMP analysis can estimate roads that may go away based on the expected travel

management and wildlife emphasis for that geographic area, but will not make final decisions about the local roads in any area. We'll estimate what kind of reduction would be needed to move toward a particular direction. (Clarification: Arterials = highways; Collectors = main connectors to highways that multiple local roads funnel traffic to; Local = access a specific area such as a recreation site or a watering area for grazing; User-created travelways = non-designated, usually don't have an administrative or recognized public access purpose, generally non-essential travelways).

Question: the point has been made that we have no data for existing roads...so how do we deal with this to avoid court? *We're not going to manage for the number of roads that are currently there – we'll say what level we'll manage for. Then, at the EA site specific level – we'll go on the ground and figure out what and where we'll keep roads.*

Clarification: How are boundaries for wildlife emphasis areas defined? Will they match Recreation/Geographic boundaries that will now follow roads, features? *Yes.*

- Eagle rock seasonal closure has always been shown correctly on wildlife map
- Recreation map corrected to match

Habitat Effectiveness Index:

Bill presented some of the key concepts of the guidelines for meeting the Primary wildlife objective for the RMP. Three of these guidelines are habitat effectiveness index, road densities, and patch sizes. The first part of the presentation illustrated the work he had done to fit the road density guidelines to the HE index and fitting these in with desired patch sizes. He had prepared several flip charts that simply illustrated the theoretical relationship of road placement on the landscape to HE index.

Example: 36 mi² – with a grid of miles that provides 2000-acre patches. Ran the model example analysis – and we ended up with 48 miles of roads = 1.3 mi/mi² but, HE was only 34%.

This was far off of the goal for 70% HE across the Township. SO: Took example of 12 miles roads, .3 mi/mi² to get 71% HE.

Another example with roads clustered at 36 miles = 1 mile/mi² = 50% HE.

Conclusion: Generally, clustered roads may be better, but site-specific analysis may also show that we'd want to avoid a cluster of roads that might create a barrier.

Remember though, other things go into how animals would actually use an area such as: hiding cover, patch size, etc. But w/ HE we're looking at patch size related to motorized travel routes. This particular model would help us maintain our desired patch size.

North Millican Concepts

Next Bill presented the work he had done on concepts for the North Millican OHV Area. The Preferred Alternative had indicated that North Millican OHV area would be targeted for a 70% HEI, with a low density of trails and large, unfragmented habitat patches. BLM did not have time to work on concepts for this area that would help us to determine if this would be workable. Bill had developed several concepts to help us work toward this goal. He started by explaining the “road influence” factors that were applied to the existing open motorized routes. For each open motorized route, different influence zones were applied (based on current science and research) that would equate to a certain level of habitat effectiveness, or HEI.

Habitat w/in $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of an open road has a 20% HEI; between $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ mile = 40% HEI; between $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{3}{4}$ mile = 60% HEI, between $\frac{3}{4}$ - 1.0 mile = 80% HE; over 1 mile = 100% HE. We identified distance bands around roads that were open - for above. The cumulative total of these distance bands equated to the total HE for an area.

Question: How does activity on a road affect use? *Don't have data for that, but some obviously less used areas will have a slightly different affect. Big ranch land with a low amount of motorized use may have better affect on use, e.g.*

Next step in the analysis: applying distance bands in concepts.

Right now, for North Millican – where are we starting, we looked at the effectiveness of the area with Hwy 20, West Butte Rd and Hwy 27. With just these, we have only 80% HE. Remember, the goal is 70% or greater. We still need to add private land considerations, etc. Don't have much to play with. (ALT 1 with seasonal closure – Dec 1 – Apr 30: In North Millican – with existing system we have 63% HE). Over 100 miles of trails in the existing area, with over 200 roads and trails.

Concepts were developed to look at different ways of getting to HE of 70% while still having a usable working OHV year round trail system. Concepts are geared toward meeting guidelines and having some usable trail system in the area open during the winter– may not be the existing system. Animals don't recognize our distance buffers, however. They won't go stand in the “green” areas. But as far as developing, AGAIN: just concepts of how guidelines will fit together. This is NOT a map of where the trails will be. Answers the questions of road densities, etc.

Concept 1. Based on Dick Dufourd's (FS/BLM IDT member) concept of trail systems that he'd like to have, but reduced trail miles and increased unfragmented habitat patch sizes (space between travel routes), with this we modeled the area at 35% HE. Hard to apply all guides equally, but resulted in approximately 82 miles of trail over the area.

Concept 4. Got to 50% HE. Patch sizes fewer but larger in some areas. Approximately 71 miles with 1.2 mi/mi^2

Concept 4 West: W/ seasonal closure on east side and expanding geo area up through west butte to capture grouse habitat. With these variables, got 65% HE, without effects of private lands etc.

Then, as a team, we sat down and tried to get to a proposal to bring to committee:

- Change HE goal from fixed figure to a range
- Patch size range would change from 1000 acre with some larger and smaller.
- Sage grouse – powerlines affect, so concentrate motorized use within ½ mile of these. Look for large unfragmented patches.
- Expand emphasis up into West Butte (better boundary), and move the western boundary of the non-motorized emphasis area west to the identified road.
- Areas within 2 miles of leks would not have any roads or motorized trails
- Areas between 2 and 4 miles of leks would have few, if any, collector or local roads or motorized trails.
- Have seasonal closures and partial seasonal closures over areas with year-round use.
- Look at areas to concentrate use (e.g. around roads/power lines). Practical, but usable, to protect breeding, nesting, wintering, habitat. Also avoiding fragmentation.

Question: This concept idea is effective – could you share with county planners so everyone is on the same page?

Comment: Think about deer management units when designing these. Check with ODFW (Maury, vs. N Paulina Units). Also think about other environmental considerations – soils, vegetation, ecosystem values, like West Butte for sage grouse and elk. A lot of other variables need to go in there. “Wildlife science is not rocket science...it’s more complex!”

Question: So – are we making a hybrid management unit? Mix of closures, densities, seasonal closures, habitat types/needs, and year round motorized use. *Yes. Language will allow this flexibility in this RMP and site-specific designs will include these concepts.*

- Trails will receive priority over roads
- Manage for motorized trail system that provides 40-80 miles of routes that would be a mix of open and seasonally closed.
- Trail systems would be designed around power lines/roads
- All open motorized routes would be counted for purposes of HE
- West Butte continued to be managed as non-motorized exclusive recreation emphasis area with winter uses (Equestrian/hiking emphasis?)

OVERALL RECREATION/WILDLIFE RECAP

4 changes proposed for the Preferred Alternative to be considered for consensus:

- La Pine: drop seasonal closure on road use for motorized
- Allow some trail links in “roads only and non-motorized emphasis” areas

- Allow for some “developed” OHV use (play area and short loop trails open in winter) in Prineville/Prineville Reservoir Area to improve mix of use.
- Allow motorized use west of Barr Road around the canals/ACEC in the Cline Buttes Block. Area available for motorized use until future management designs a limited trail system (around canyons and canals).
- Modify wildlife guidelines for North Millican
 - Drop HE from 70 to 50-60 range
 - Patch size would range by habitat conditions – smaller than 1000 acre would not be prime habitat and much larger would be key habitat.
 - Avoid motorized trails within 2-4 miles of leks, avoid high value habitat
 - Seasonal restrictions on areas/portions of mechanized/motorized trails (40-80 miles trail routes).

Comments:

- Suggest that with planning OHV play areas near Prineville Reservoir that you coordinate with the county, BOR, etc.
- **Question:** What is our incentive as a group to come to consensus? Is there a reason that we should try to come together now vs. stonewalling consensus? What if I think BLM may come up with a better end result that the group will come up with? *Provides BLM with best input, and there is a lot of weight in consensus. Gives line officer the range of perspective, and the results of people thoughtfully considering the needs of the community as a whole. Helps us make a valid decision. In situations where there is a significant impact to people, it is an important issue and worth investing time. Sometimes the BEST you can do is meet halfway – compromise. This type of decision holds longer, more respect, more input and investment. One winner/one loser means someone has no investment in the outcome.*
- **Question:** What about folks thinking about what happens in their own backyard? Or, what if the consensus decision harms another resource? *BLM is part of the consensus, and as a group with a variety of interests we shouldn't have that outcome. We've taken unreasonable or things we can't live with off the table. Changes at this point are serious, and we won't make them just because. We'll need valid reasons.*
- **Question:** Would 2-4 miles apply to all leks in planning area? Proposal applies to North Millican, S. Millican already has a seasonal closure and guidelines. This expands on Common to All guidelines. And would it apply to active leks? *Applies to active leks, but we'd have to refer to protocol for determining if a lek was inactive. And what if a new lek forms? Draw on adaptive management strategy – talk about “how should we manage that lek” – but we would respond pro-actively.*
- **Question:** Does the language “shared” distinguish between shared uses on the same trail, and “sharing” an area with separate trails? *Yes, language provides for both options where needed.*

Specific Discussion

La Pine: drop seasonal closure on road use for motorized

Southern 1/3 south of Hwy 31/Hwy 97 Junction. Had a seasonal closure to provide additional protection during winter for elk. Change to allow some OHV use in La Pine area to provide link to adjacent trail systems. Also provides access to National Forest lands by snowmobiles during the winter. Addresses shortage of OHV opportunities in immediate La Pine area. We have small play area (Rosland). All designated as Open right now, preferred alt would put a designated system here and it needs to be large enough to use it safely. Seasonal closure Dec-April.

INTERESTS:

Future needs – can the area be closed in the future if needed? ODFW doesn't need elk closure, but what if we need more closure for deer or another species during another season? Or in the future? *As an agency, we have the authority to place a closure wherever we want to protect something. But, we'd like to give people a sense of the types of tools the Plan might use. Maybe we won't use it, but like to have it there.*

Wildlife – protected by wildlife primary emphasis; which would impact road/trail densities, etc.

Wildlife – elk key emphasis area, which doesn't seem that important, but also mule deer migration - but mostly spring and fall movements.

Community Representation – is this representing La Pine community needs? *Yes, heard from residents during public meetings...especially snowmobilers.*

Wildlife – can HE of 70% be applied here? *Fragmentation makes this unrealistic – so some other guidelines may be needed here. We'll get as close as we can, but we need to describe better what this means.*

Management – flexibility and assurances. Can we leave the “option/potential” for a closure if needed to manage for wildlife? Either leave option to have one, or have option to remove one?

Management – can we add a general guideline that allows “seasonal closure” as a tool to meet primary wildlife emphasis area requirements? Apply/remove as needed.

CONSENSUS Question: Can we remove motorized seasonal closure designation language in La Pine?

Continued 4/15

Allow some trail links in “roads only and non-motorized emphasis”

Continued 4/15

Allow for some “developed” OHV use in Prineville/Prineville Reservoir Area to improve mix of use.

Continued 4/15

Allow motorized use west of Barr Road on the canals outside the Tumalo Canal ACEC in the Cline Buttes Block.

What we're looking at for this area:

- One spot closed to all motorized use (area east of Cline Falls Hwy).
- Can we reasonably close the rest? *No, lots of access.*
- Block will have designated trails, and trail links for motorized use
- Block will also have designated trails for non-motorized.
- Tumalo ACEC will protect prime canals (canals with archeological integrity)
- Canyons may not available to ride/emphasis on non-motorized; secondary wildlife emphasis
- Remaining canals and area will have some flexibility for how we design the trail system. When we do this, we'll deal with PHS, private land, distribution of uses, etc.
- Cannot ID how many miles of each will be allocate.

(NOTE: We're getting away from "you can do anything out of your backyard onto BLM"; "Designated" trail system means that not everyone will be able to go right out their back yard. Each person doesn't get their own trail...)

PA currently states that the canals (inside and/or berm) will be protected in the Tumalo ACEC from (horse, mountain bike, motorized); the rest of canals west of Barr Rd will be managed as a non-motorized system within a motorized area. Comments received said that maybe the BLM should allow more flexibility for future management. Closed originally due to public input as a rec experience issue.

INTERESTS/CONCERNS:

- **Landowner** – people who live around the perimeter would want some sort of buffer zone between public and private for noise and dust
- **Safety** – sharing trails
- **Wildlife** – raptor nest sites protected, some seasonal closures, secondary wildlife emphasis on west side/canyons.
- **Recreation** – motorized users in Cline Buttes want to be able to access trails for bikes/quads without loading up and going somewhere else.
- **Safety** – control OHV use/speed while near residences.
- **Recreation** – maintaining an adequate riding area since crossing highway 126 is difficult and unsafe. Area north of highway too small to ride for a long period of time.
- **Recreation** – dealing with influx of users based on advertised location. Seem to be allowing more urban interface experiences.
- **Wildlife** – maintaining wildlife connectivity, elk habitat and use.
- **Cultural Values** – canals are not managed for preservation outside the Tumalo ACEC
- **Management** – manageability, what can BLM implement and enforce.
- **Language** – make sure it doesn't require motorized use, just allows flexibility if BLM chooses to designate trails.
- **Wildlife** – without identifying the level of OHV carrying capacity, have no idea if my wildlife protection radar should go off. Besides protecting raptors, what sideboards are in place to protect the wildlife that are there? (In order to mix uses,

although language may not be specific to an exact carrying capacity, intuitively we would balance uses and needs).

- **Vegetation** – balancing use with erosion and vegetation damage.

CONSENSUS Question: can we remove language that designates canals as non-motorized?

Yes. All 2 and above.

Open Public Forum:

No members of the public were present, other alternate Issue Team members were invited to move to the table and share their views/questions.

Meeting adjourned.